

Convention who were for retaining the confederation and amending its articles; but the majority was against this, and was for a national government. Mr. Patterson's propositions, which were for continuing the articles of confederation with additional powers, were submitted to the Convention of the 5th of June, and referred to the committee of the whole. And the resolutions forming the basis of a national government, which had once been agreed to in the committee of the whole, and reported, were re-committed to the same committee on the same day. The Convention, then, in committee of the whole, on the 19th of June, had both these plans before them; that is to say, the plan of a confederacy or compact between States, and the plan of a national government. Both these plans were considered and debated, and the committee reported, 'that they do not agree to the propositions offered by the Hon. Mr. Patterson, but that they again submit the resolutions formerly reported.' If, sir, any historical fact in the world be plain and undeniable, it is that the Convention deliberated on the expediency of continuing the confederation with some amendments, and rejected that scheme, and adopted the plan of a national government, with a legislature, an executive, and a judiciary of its own. They were asked to preserve the league; they rejected the proposition. They were asked to continue the existing compact between States; they rejected it. They rejected compact, league and confederation, and set themselves about framing the Constitution of a national government; and they accomplished what they undertook."

I do not intend to introduce any more authorities upon that. I think the House has heard enough. But I wish to reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Miller,) upon the subject of naturalization. He said that when aliens were naturalized they were required to take the oath of allegiance to the State where they were naturalized, but only the oath to support the Constitution of the United States so far as allegiance to the General Government is concerned. I had had occasion to administer the oath of naturalization to foreigners, and my memory did not serve me that such was the fact. So I have taken occasion to procure the form of the certificate, which is this:

"Be it remembered, that on the — day of —, in the year aforesaid, N. N., a native of —, and at present residing in the — of —, appeared in open court here, and applied to be admitted to become a citizen of the United States. And it appearing to the satisfaction of the court here, that the said N. N. had declared on oath, taken in the —, on the — day of —, in the year —, two years at least before his admission, that it was *bona fide* his intention to become

a citizen of the United States. And it also appearing to the satisfaction of the court here, upon the testimony of W. W. and T. T., citizens of the United States, that the said N. N. hath continued to reside within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States, five years at least, and one year at least, immediately preceding this application, within the State of Maryland; that during the said term of five years he hath resided in —, and hath conducted himself as a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness; and the said N. N. having declared on oath, taken in open court here, that he will support the Constitution of the United States, and that he doth absolutely and entirely renounce all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state and sovereignty whatever, and particularly all allegiance and fidelity to the —. The court here, thereupon admits the said N. N. to become a citizen of the United States."

There is not a word said with reference to allegiance to the State of Maryland, but only that he shall reside one year in the State prior to his being naturalized.

Instances might be multiplied; but I do not regard it necessary; and I think the Convention has been amply entertained in that respect. What is the use of speculating in reference to this question? What does it all amount to? What does it prove? What are the facts now?

Whether State rights are right or wrong, whether State sovereignty is right or wrong, it has resulted in a strife of arms between the Government of the United States and those who have availed themselves of the pretext of the State rights idea. Then what does it become us as wise men to do? Are we to stand here on the margin of the stream and trifle in reference to this thing? We must do one of two things. We must ally or range ourselves on the side of the American Republic, in which our common destiny is wound up and involved, or we must combat that government, and range ourselves on the side of the rebels against the government. I submit to the gentlemen of this House, how is the States rights idea to be carried out, if it were to be allowed to be the true idea? Are we in Maryland to come up here and call upon the federal arms, or the national authority, to protect us in our rights, and privileges, and immunities, and subjugate the States rights men of the State of Maryland, or are they to subjugate us? That is the question to be determined. If we have the majority and the power we can put them down, and if they have the majority and the power they can put us down. They have not the power to-day, even if they had the will, to enforce the States rights idea in the State of Maryland. This is, in my opinion, no time to